

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

QUILLON EDWARD CLEMONS,

Plaintiff,

v.

PAUL PASTOR, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. C10-5235 RJB/KLS

ORDER DENYING LETTER REQUEST  
TO CERTIFY CLASS AND POSTPONE  
ACTION

Before the court is Plaintiff's letter to the Clerk requesting that this matter be postponed and that his case be certified as a class. Dkt. 3. Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* filed on April 5, 2010 has been granted under separate Order.

In his letter, Plaintiff states that he wishes the court to process his requests, but to postpone procedures due to difficulties he is experiencing in obtaining "all the needed information." Dkt. 3. Plaintiff is advised that this case shall proceed according to normal court practice. Alternatively, Plaintiff may file a motion to voluntarily dismiss his case without prejudice for the court's consideration. Plaintiff would then be free to file his complaint at a time that is more agreeable to him.

Plaintiff also asks that his case be certified as a class action. Dkt. 3. The factually specific nature of the claims raised in Plaintiff's proposed complaint and the court's experience with multiple pro se litigation convinces the court that the Plaintiff should proceed separately

1 with his individual claims. Plaintiff cannot act on behalf of others, but must bring his action on  
2 his own behalf and must plead specific conduct that has been committed by a person or persons  
3 acting under color of state law that deprived him of a right, privilege or immunity secured by the  
4 Constitution. Plaintiff must plead specific facts showing how and when and by whom he was  
5 harmed by that conduct.

6  
7 Plaintiff is further advised that a pro se party may not represent the interests of other  
8 persons. Although a non-attorney may appear pro se on behalf of himself, he has no authority to  
9 appear as an attorney for others. *C.E. Pope Equity Trust v. United States*, 818 F.2d 696, 697 (9th  
10 Cir. 1987); *Johns v. County of San Diego*, 114 F.3d 874, 876 (9th Cir. 1997). If Plaintiff  
11 believes a class action is the appropriate vehicle to address the issues he has standing to raise, he  
12 may file a motion for class certification and should refer to Local Rule 23 governing the format  
13 and timing for bringing motions to certify a class.

14  
15 Finally, Plaintiff is advised that all future filings with the court shall be in the form of a  
16 motion, properly noted and served upon opposing counsel before the court will take action  
17 regarding the filing.

18 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

19 (1) Plaintiff's motion to certify class and for postponement of action (Dkt. 3) is  
20 **DENIED**.

21 (2) The Clerk of the Court shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff.

22  
23 DATED this 29th day of April, 2010.

24  
25   
26 Karen L. Strombom  
United States Magistrate Judge